

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 09-CR-0043-SPF
)	
LINDSEY KENT SPRINGER, and)	
OSCAR AMOS STILLEY,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Before the court is defendant Stilley's Motion to Continue Sentencing, doc. 326, filed on April 6, 2010. The government has responded to the motion, doc. no. 328, and defendant Stilley has filed a reply, doc. no. 330. The motion is at issue.

The court has carefully considered the contentions set forth in Mr. Stilley's motion. For a number of reasons, some legal, some factual, and some procedural, the court concludes that Mr. Stilley's contentions are without merit and that his motion should accordingly be denied.


Without necessarily canvassing all of the points asserted by Mr. Stilley in his motion, the court notes that, in general, Mr. Stilley argues that he lacks various kinds of information. In substance, he contends that he needs more factual information, as well as information as to the probation officer's analysis of the case for sentencing purposes and as to the government's contentions with respect to some of the issues relating to the application of the advisory sentencing guidelines. In evaluating the merits of these contentions, the court has taken into account, and reviewed as necessary, the relevant (and voluminous) pleadings and briefs in this case, as well as

the presentence report as originally disclosed, the government's sentencing memorandum, and the exhibits which were received in evidence at trial. In addition, the court is, of course, cognizant of the fact that the materials produced on discovery in this case include substantial amounts of information aside from that shown by the exhibits which were received in evidence.

Having given due consideration to the nature, quality and volume of the information which has been provided to Mr. Stilley and to the analysis of that information which is plainly evident in the presentence investigation report and in the government's sentencing memorandum, the court concludes that Mr. Stilley's contention that he lacks the information he needs in order to prepare for sentencing and to defend himself at sentencing is without merit.

Accordingly, defendant Oscar Stilley's Motion to Continue Sentencing is **DENIED.**

Dated April 9, 2010.



STEPHEN P. FRIOT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE